

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-21 and 24 are now in the case. Amended claims 1 and 18 find support, at least, in original claim 4. Claim 4 has been canceled.

Response to the Office Action

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Leonard '564 in view of Leonard '380, Purzycki and Redford

Claims 1-21 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,178,564 to Leonard et al. (hereinafter "Leonard '564") in view of U.S. Patent 6,662,380 to Leonard et al. (hereinafter "Leonard '380") and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,666,671 to Purzycki et al. (hereinafter "Purzycki") and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,210,884 to Redford (hereinafter "Redford"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations. Specifically, none of the cited references teach or suggest a lavatory bowl rim block having both 1) a liquid, perfume-containing composition with a dispenser, 2) a fragrance delivery component in which the fragrance is not dispensed using the liquid, perfume-containing composition dispensing means and 3) the fragrance delivery component is selected from the group consisting of : fragranced gels; fragranced plastics; a wick delivery system comprising fragrance-containing liquid; permeable film delivery systems combined with a fragranced gel or fragranced liquid; and battery powered / electrical fragrance release systems; and combinations thereof.

Leonard '564 discloses that the use of capillary channels on the dispensing plate "is very significant in delivering a steady level of fragrance between flushes as the surface area for the capillary channels insures that adequate fragrance is delivered to the atmosphere after each flush" (see Col. 8, lines 43-47). This is cited in the Office Action as the teaching of "long term release of the perfume to the atmosphere" (see page 2 of the Office Action). Applicants contend that this disclosure does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. First, this is clearly not a separate fragrance

delivery component. None of the cited references teach or suggest using a separate fragrance delivery component that does not dispense a fragrance using the dispensing means. Second, Leonard '564 does not deliver a fragrance using a component selected from the group consisting of: fragranced gels; fragranced plastics; a wick delivery system comprising fragrance-containing liquid; permeable film delivery systems combined with a fragranced gel or fragranced liquid; and battery powered / electrical fragrance release systems; and combinations thereof. Therefore, Leonard '564 fails to teach or suggest at least two required elements of Applicants claimed invention.

Leonard '380 is cited as teaching two separate compositions. This reference fails to teach the same elements missing from Leonard '564. It does not teach a separate fragrance delivery component that does not dispense a fragrance using the dispensing means. Also, it does not deliver a fragrance using a component selected from the group consisting of: fragranced gels; fragranced plastics; a wick delivery system comprising fragrance-containing liquid; permeable film delivery systems combined with a fragranced gel or fragranced liquid; and battery powered / electrical fragrance release systems; and combinations thereof. Leonard '380 does not disclose the use of a fragrance in the solid composition. Therefore, Applicants contend that Leonard '380 does not teach or suggest at least two required elements of Applicants claimed invention.

Neither Purzycki or Redford teach all the elements of Applicants claimed invention. None of the cited references teach or suggest a separate fragrance delivery component. The Office Action states "People of ordinary skill in cleaning are well aware of using multiple fragrances. This is not considered beyond the knowledge of chemist or formulators." Applicants contend that the claimed invention is not solely directed towards combining more than one fragrance in a cleaning composition. Applicants' claimed invention addresses the ongoing need for prolonged fragrance delivery to the bathroom atmosphere in addition to a bowl cleaning composition. The prior art references cited in the Office Action all use perfumes as part of the cleaning composition.

Furthermore, there is no motivation provided for one skilled in the art to devise a separate fragrance delivery component. The references use perfumes as part of the cleaning composition(s) to provide a fragrance benefit. There is no indication in the references that this is ineffective. Therefore, there is no motivation to prepare a separate area dedicated to releasing a fragrance.

Applicants' claimed invention relates to a novel method of providing the dual benefit of lavatory bowl cleaning and a separate fragrance source that provides a prolonged scent benefit. The references cited in the Office Action all relate to providing scent via the bowl cleaning composition (liquid or solid). Applicants' claimed invention clearly requires the presence of a fragrance delivery component that does not use the dispenser for the liquid bowl cleaner. Applicants respectfully submit that this separate fragrance element is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references. Therefore, Applicants contend that the combination of Leonard '564 in view of Leonard '380, Purzycki and Redford does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they don't disclose an element of Applicants' claimed invention (see MPEP 2143.03). As a result, Applicants contend that their claimed invention is novel and unobvious and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that Claims 1-3, 5-21 and 24 are in condition for allowance.
Early and favorable action on all claims is therefore requested.

If the next action is other than to allow the claims, the favor of a telephonic interview is requested with the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

/Brent M. Peebles/

Brent M. Peebles

Registration No. 38,576

(513) 983-0400

Dated: August 10, 2009
Customer No. 27752